

REMARKS

The above amendments are made in response to the Office action of May 31, 2007. The Examiner's reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the above amendment and the following remarks.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the allowance of claims 3-11 for the reasons given on pages 2 and 3 of the present Office action.

Claims 1, 3, 5 and 9 have been amended and claims 12-15 are new. Claims 1-15 are pending in the present application. Support for the amendment to claims 1, 3, 5 and 9 can be found at least in the specification, claims and figures as originally filed. Support for new claims 12-15 may be found at least in Claims 10 and 11 of the application as filed. No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In order to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a single source must contain all of the elements of the claim. *Lewmar Marine v. Barient, Inc.*, 827 F.2d 744, 747, 3 U.S.P.Q.2d 1766, 1768 (Fed. Cir. 1987), *cert denied*, 484 U.S. 1007 (1988). Moreover, the single source must disclose all of the claimed elements "arranged as in the claim." *Structural Rubber Prods. Co. v. Park Rubber Co.*, 749 F.2d 707, 716, 223 U.S.P.Q. 1264, 1274 (Fed. Cir. 1984). Missing elements may not be supplied by the knowledge of one skilled in the art or the disclosure of another reference. *Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner*, 778 F.2d 775, 780, 227 U.S.P.Q. 773, 777 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Takahara et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,469,278, hereinafter "Takahara"). The Examiner states that Takahara discloses all of the elements of the abovementioned claims, primarily in elements 13, 16a and 16b. Applicants respectfully traverse for at least the reason set forth below.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, "a scattering layer defining an outer surface of the panel, the scattering layer containing fillers for inducing light scattering indicated as haze value . . ."

Takahara merely discloses a liquid crystal panel including a liquid crystal/polymer composite between two substrates, one of which having a matrix of pixel

electrodes. (Abstract) Therefore, Takahara merely discloses a “scattering layer” as the liquid crystal layer disposed on inner surfaces of the substrates defining the liquid crystal panel.

Takahara does not teach or suggest a scattering layer defining an outer surface of the panel, the scattering layer containing fillers for inducing light scattering indicated as haze value, as in amended independent claim 1. thus claim 1, including claims depending therefrom, i.e., claim 2, defines over Takahara.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the claimed invention is allowable over the cited references. The Examiner’s withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 2, and their subsequent allowance is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In light of the above remarks, the present application including claims 1-14 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections. If there are any charges due with respect to this response, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130 maintained by Applicants’ Attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /James J. Merrick/
James J. Merrick 43,801
Confirmation No. 1575
Cantor Colburn LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
PTO Customer No. 23413
Telephone: (860) 286-2929
Fax: (860) 286-0115

Date: September 28, 2007